

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 14, 2007, claim 11 has been amended and claim 21 has been newly added. Claims 11-21 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added. The amendment and new claim are supported by the original written description, at a minimum: page 7, lines 14-24; page 14, line 13 to page 15, line 3; and page 15 line 21, to page 17, line 7.

Claims 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,990,583 to Matsayuma et al. (hereinafter Matsayuma). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 11 recites, in pertinent part, “generating, in response to the certificate issuing request by the issuing authority, a public key certificate including the contents signed by the registration authority, the signature to the contents signed by the registration authority, issuing contents to be issued by the issuing authority, and an issuing authority signature to the contents signed by the registration authority, the signature to the contents signed by the registration authority and the issuing contents issued by the issuing authority; and sending the public key certificate from the issuing authority to the registration authority for being registered within the registration authority.” These limitations are described in the specification at page 7, lines 14-24.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that “each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). At a minimum, the cited prior art does not disclose (expressly or inherently) the above recited limitations.

The Office Action asserts, at pages 4 and 5, that Matsuyama discloses generating, by the registration authority, a signature to contents registered to public key certificate at FIG. 16A and lines 24-34 of column 20, and the other limitations of claim 11 are disclosed at at FIG. 19; and column 3 lines 22-40; column 22 lines 15-67; column 23 lines 1-5, column 22 lines 64-67, column 23 lines 1-5, and column 20 lines 24-29.

However, Matsuyama does not teach or suggest, “a public key certificate including the contents signed by the registration authority, the signature to the contents signed by the registration authority, issuing contents to be issued by the issuing authority, and an issuing authority signature to the contents signed by the registration authority,” as recited by claim 11.

Thus, Applicant submits that independent claim 11 is not anticipated by Matsuyama.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is allowable if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as independent claim 11 is allowable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also patentable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 12-20 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 11.

Independent claim 21 recites, in pertinent part, “generating, in response to the certificate issuing request, a public key certificate including: (B-1) the contents signed by the registration authority; (B-2) the signature to the contents signed by the registration authority; (B-3) issuing contents to be issued by the issuing authority and (B-4) an issuing authority signature to the contents signed by the registration authority, the signature to the contents signed by the

Application No.: 10/076,624

registration authority and the issuing contents issued by the issuing authority, the public key certificate being sent to the registration authority and registered within the registration authority.”

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21 is not anticipated by Matsuyama for reasons similar to independent claim 11.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Application No.: 10/076,624

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Eduardo Garcia-Otero

Eduardo Garcia-Otero
Registration No. 56,609

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 KEG/EG:cac
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 14, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1428257-2.062807.0040